

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Describing urban soils by a faceted system ensures more informed decision-making

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1532748> since 2016-09-12T18:29:15Z

Published version:

DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.10.025>

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Describing urban soils through a faceted system ensures more informed decision-making**

2

3 **KEYWORDS:** urban soils; soil information transfer; ecosystem services; soil functions; facets

4

5 **ABSTRACT**

6 Urban areas are increasing worldwide at a dramatic rate and their soils definitely deserve more atten-
7 tion than they have received in the past. In urban environments, soils potentially provide the same
8 ecosystem services as in rural and wild environments, although in some cases they are depleted of
9 their basic functions, such as when they lose their productive and filtering capacities because of seal-
10 ing, and become mere supports for infrastructures. In other cases, soils of urban areas acquire new
11 functions that are unique to these environments. Current soil classifications fail to effectively account
12 for the complexity of urban soils and the information that is required for their management. Addi-
13 tionally, the survey of urban soils is difficult, due to fragmentation and rapid land use change and the
14 fact that due to human pressure their properties seldom vary linearly and predictably according to
15 landforms, which hinders the effectiveness of geostatistics. The conventional practice of grouping
16 similar soils and transferring their information in a concise manner is not viable for urban soils. We
17 advocate the introduction of a faceted system – i.e. a scheme using semantic categories, either general
18 or subject-specific, that are combined to create the full classification entry – to organize the infor-
19 mation on urban soils to support decision-making. The facets that such a system should be based on
20 are not only the intrinsic physical and chemical properties that are usually used to describe any soil,
21 but also other tangible or even immaterial properties that are particularly meaningful in an urban
22 context, such as landscape metrics, or aesthetic, social and historical values. As well as providing
23 more adequately the information of the type requested by urban planners and policymakers, a faceted
24 system of classification of urban soil resources would have the flexibility to accommodate all avail-
25 able or future scattered, rapidly changing, or incomplete data.

1. Introduction

Soil provides food, biomass and raw materials to humankind. It is a platform for human activities, a main component of the landscape, an archive of heritage, a filter for groundwater quality, and the most important terrestrial storage of carbon and biodiversity. Soil stores, filters and transforms many substances, including water, nutrients and carbon (Commission of the European Communities, 2006). A thorough review of the literature about soil properties and the associated ecosystem services has been just compiled by Adhikari and Hartemink (2016). Soil sustains an expanding population that is increasingly living in cities (Anonymous, 2010; United Nations, 2014). As a consequence, urban areas are experiencing a progressive enlargement that involves peri-urban soils, completely removing or converting them to *urban* soils (Figure 1). In urban contexts, soils potentially provide the same ecosystem services as other soils but their role of physical support for infrastructures frequently overcomes all others (Grimm et al., 2008). In most cases, urban soils experience serious depletion of their basic functions, in particular biomass production, biodiversity conservation, and carbon sequestration. Therefore, urban soils are different, in many aspects, from their agricultural, forest or natural counterparts (e.g. Biasioli et al., 2006; Ellis, 2011; Pickett et al., 2011), so much so that the traditional approaches for describing and mapping them often seem inappropriate.

While in the countryside land use is mostly planned on the basis of the soil's intrinsic properties, in cities soil uses essentially depend on site location. However, cities are highly dynamic environments where soil use changes rather frequently due to the continuous reorganization of the urban tissue (Hollis, 1991; Norra and Stüben, 2003; Rossiter, 2007). Topsoil horizons are often reworked and obliterated, mixed with, or even replaced by, allochthonous materials (Nehls et al., 2013; Scharenbroch et al., 2005). Buildings and other infrastructures progressively sprawl in the country, sealing an increasing proportion of soils, making them unsuitable for performing crucial environmental purposes, such as draining rainwater or producing biomasses (Nuissl et al., 2009; Scalenghe and Ajmone-Marsan, 2009; Schmidt et al., 2004). As a consequence, urban soils appear fragmented and of very variable quality (European Environment Agency, 2011; Han, 2010; Kasanko et al., 2006; Kent, 2009). The patches of unsealed soils often experience some forms of degradation. For instance, a highway junction (Figure 1) degrades the soils of the area it includes by changing their hydrology and imposing severe contamination from traffic, but also dramatically affecting the access to animals and seeds. Overall, the functional, ecological and aesthetic meaning of the area is drastically modified. On the other hand, the issue of city sprawl (Anonymous, 2010) calls for a smarter, more compacted city design and encourages the reclamation and reuse of dismissed soils (Hou and Al-Tabbaa, 2014). Vast urban and peri-urban industrial areas are being dismissed in Western countries as a result

59 of the evolution and delocalization of manufacturing activities. Such areas, usually called *brown-*
60 *fields*, are sometimes reconverted to other uses after remediation action aimed at removing undesired
61 or dangerous features.

62 Parks and gardens are another example of how urban soil functions are modified by urbanization.
63 Green areas are highly appreciated in cities, where they improve air quality, mitigate urban heat and
64 provide an agreeable environment for citizens (Qin et al., 2013; Tzoulas and James, 2010). They also
65 play a role in enhancing the value of the neighbouring houses (Maruani and Amit-Cohen, 2013; Pan-
66 duro and Veie, 2013). The *biomass production* function in urban settlements can then be as valuable
67 as outside the city, but it acquires distinct features. The soils of parks and gardens, rather than pro-
68 ducing an agricultural yield, are expected to provide welfare.

69 In reality, in urban settings the soils often fail to provide a suitable habitat for plants. Soil ecology
70 and nutrient cycling in urban green areas are altered because of soil turbation, compaction, and pol-
71 lution. Lorenz and Lal (2009) have reviewed data about the biogeochemical cycles of carbon and
72 nitrogen in urban soils and revealed a great horizontal and vertical variability of both elements in
73 view of the many human activities that can directly or indirectly alter those cycles. Carbon variability
74 is usually much lower in the soils surrounding cities, in spite of the different requirements of crops
75 (Scalenghe et al., 2011; Vasenev et al., 2014).

76 Contamination is another common feature of urban soils (Andersson et al., 2010; Costa et al., 2012;
77 Giusti, 2011; Guillén et al., 2012; Qiao et al., 2011; Schwarz et al., 2012). The mapping of urban soil
78 pollution was proposed as a medical tool for prevention purposes (Abrahams, 2006). Ajmone-Marsan
79 and Biasioli (2010) collated a vast array of data about heavy metals' contamination in soils from 140
80 cities worldwide and found that most cities are contaminated by one or more trace elements. Organic
81 pollutants are also common in the soils of urban and peri-urban areas (Morillo et al., 2007; Wang et
82 al., 2013), confirming the environmental relevance of the urban soil system.

83 In summary, urban soils are required to provide more, and different, services than the classic ecolog-
84 ical and productive functions for which the most widely used soil classification systems were born
85 and have been developed. That is what makes it difficult to use these classifications with urban soils.

86

87 1.1. Soil classification in the urban context

88 Classification is a procedure to group material or immaterial things on the basis of shared character-
89 istics. In hierarchical classifications, groups are distributed in ranks or categories, where the range of
90 diagnostic properties of any group narrows as the system becomes more detailed. Soils are particu-
91 larly difficult to categorize and map, since the variation of their properties in the landscape are more
92 often continuous than discrete, which means that boundaries have to be arbitrarily established.

93 Soil classification was anecdotally born in 1877 in St Petersburg, Russia, when Vasily Vasili'evich
94 Dokuchaev conducted the first pedological investigation (Arnold, 2006). The observation of zonal
95 properties of climate, geology and vegetation was sufficient, at that time, to determine or infer general
96 soil properties and the driving processes of soil formation on a large scale. Since that first rough form
97 of classification, the *production function* of the soil was the pivot around which many of the ensuing
98 classifications have been developed, given the importance of agriculture to humankind. One example
99 is the Fertility Capability Soil Classification System (FCC), which classifies soils on the basis of
100 attributes important for plant growth (Sanchez et al., 1982, 2003), or the Land Use Capability (LUC),
101 which is mainly based on potential land uses (e.g. Curran-Cournane et al., 2014). There are other soil
102 classifications. Some are of interest in engineering and geotechnics and are centred on the ability of
103 soil to support buildings and roads or to deform because of earthquake-induced vibrations. Such clas-
104 sifications are based on soil texture (e.g. Chatterjee and Choudhury, 2013) or other properties related
105 to the physical behaviour of soil (e.g. Boaga, 2013). Attempts have been made to classify soils ac-
106 cording to their *filter*, *buffer* and *reactor* function, which allow transformations of components or
107 solutes. In the case of landfill planning, soil productivity, biological activity, and soil permeability
108 are normally the key parameters for sorting classes of suitability in this regard (Kara and Doratli,
109 2012; Moeinaddini et al., 2010). Vilček and Bujnovský (2014) have proposed a soil environmental
110 index (SEI) to categorize soil's ability to retain water, immobilize pollutants and eventually transform
111 them into less harmful forms. Such an index can be used for the assessment of ecological systems,
112 planning of land use, and for expressing the economic benefits of individual ecosystems. The *re-*
113 *source function*, the capability to supply raw materials, is typically fatal to soil as it involves its total
114 removal, and this would be the case for a drastic yes/no classification. The *habitat function*, i.e. the
115 ability of soils to provide a living environment for plants and animals, is mirrored in the concept of
116 soil biodiversity. The available information, however, is fragmented and a systematic organization of
117 soils on a biological basis has not been hitherto attempted (Gardi et al., 2013; Jeffery, et al., 2010).

118 Modern soil classifications (IUSS Working Group WRB, 2014; Soil Survey Staff, 2014) are of the
119 domain-analytic type and therefore are knowledge intensive (Hjørland, 2013a). They are based on
120 the identification of a *diagnostic horizon*, i.e. a layer whose properties unequivocally reveal the com-
121 bination of the chemical, physical and biological processes that transformed the original materials
122 into a soil (viz. the *pedogenesis*).

123 Soils are usually named and classified directly in the field, based on the description of the sequence
124 of genetic horizons and their pivotal properties (Table 1), as well as the identification of one or more
125 diagnostic horizons. Soil properties are assumed to be homogeneous for a given area and their spatial
126 homogeneity is usually inferred from site features, such as landforms, lithology, drainage, vegetation,
127 land use, or surface soil features, such as colour or stoniness (Holmgren, 1988). On that basis, large-

scale and progressively more detailed soil maps have been produced (Hartemink et al., 2013). A quantum leap in soil classification and mapping occurred with the use of computers and numerical classifications (Deng, 2007; Fitzpatrick, 1967). The general principles and scopes, however, remained focussed on agriculture. Soil science subsequently introduced geostatistics to define the boundaries of soil properties, based on an adequate number of samples and measurements. Soil mapping is better achieved by regionalizing the variables, rather than interpolating between points in space, using a stochastic model that considers the diverse spatial trends of the soil property of interest, e.g. the concentration of a single plant nutrient or pollutant. Such a method, known as *kriging*, is based on the assumption that near things are more interconnected than the distant ones (Cattle et al., 2002; Heuvelink and Webster, 2001).

Whatever the scope or the method, the current soil classifications are not able to account for the variety of soils occurring in urban settings (Figure 2). Perhaps more importantly, such classifications do not take into account many features and properties crucial for describing the potential and limitations of soils in the urban context, where diversity is so high that one could even conclude that soils *sensu stricto* are missing (Dudal et al., 2005). In extra-urban environments, several conceptual frameworks for the quantification of soil functions/ecosystem services have been successfully proposed (e.g. Kabisch, 2015; Schulte et al., 2014), but they are not applicable to cities, where random sampling of soils and representation of their unpredictable distribution are difficult goals. The requirement of identifying a diagnostic horizon to name soils at the highest hierarchical levels is a serious hindrance to classifying urban soils, as the original horizons are often being cancelled by human disturbances, or soil sampling is prevented by the superimposed artefacts. If a statistically representative sampling of soils is prevented, assuming spatial homogeneity is incorrect. Often, the recognition of urban soils as discrete entities (Aparin and Sukhacheva, 2014; Lebedeva and Gerasimova 2011; Lehmann and Stahr 2007) is implausible, as seldom do soil properties in urban settings show a linear, or any other type of regular variability, which is the *sine qua non* of geostatistics. In fact, soil surveys and mapping tend to exclude urban areas (Brevik et al., 2015), except for some local issues such as parks or other unpaved areas. Conventional soil maps represent urban areas as indistinct grey or black polygons that do not capture the internal soil complexity (Sanchez et al., 2009). On the scale of the European Soil Database 2.0, urban and peri-urban soils appear unsorted as endemic soil minorities (Ibáñez et al., 2013). Even in the more advanced means of cartographic representation, such as the smartphone app *mySoil* (Natural Environment Research Council, 2013), organized information about urban areas is often missing.

The crucial point is whether the diagnostic horizons and any soil features that are usually utilized to classify agricultural, forest or unmanaged soils are sufficient and all-meaningful for appropriately

describing urban soils. As postulated by Bouma and Droogers (2007) a *regionalization of the approach to soil issues*, i.e. the development of methods that address local problems – and more specifically urban soil features – would facilitate contact with stakeholders and policymakers. A faceted system framework, i.e. a scheme using semantic categories, either general or subject-specific, that are combined to create the full classification entry, seems highly functional for categorizing urban soils and this paper discusses its viability (Figure 3). Contrary to classical enumerative classifications, which contain a full set of entries for all concepts, faceted classification (FC) systems use a set of semantically cohesive categories that are combined as needed to create an expression of a concept. In this way, a faceted classification is open, and not limited to already defined concepts.

2. A faceted classification for urban soils

The multiform and rapidly changing urban environments demand a new type of flexible soil categorization, functional for various and dynamic purposes (Arnold, 2006). Farmers are usually interested in soil fertility, hence in soil properties such as nutrients' supply, water retention, pH, organic matter content or particle size distribution, and these are generally provided by ordinary classifications, which also account for the soil formation processes. Urban soil users and stakeholders require additional or alternative information, which, in most cases, is peculiar to urban settings and is not taken into consideration by current soil taxonomies. A piece of land in the urban context can be evaluated from different points of views by different stakeholders, often representing contrasting interests. Nevertheless, none of them may be interested in the information about that soil provided by the classic classifications. For example, a property developer will mainly take the extent and the beauty of the area of interest and its surroundings into account, while a land planner will focus more on the topography of the area and the geochemical properties of its soils. Residents and potential buyers, on the other hand, are mainly interested in the beauty of the place and the type of facilities it benefits from (number and type of green areas, proximity to other services, i.e. degree of fragmentation/dispersion, distance to the nearest railway station and so on). A local Environmental Protection Agency pays attention to the type and degree of contamination to implement reclamation measures, while a municipality responsible for distributing allotments for private horticulture takes into account the size and shape of the area, soil fertility and contamination and, of course, the property rights. With time, financial, economic, demographic, and social changes may modify the interests of the various stakeholders towards a given urban soil more swiftly than any classical classification system (e.g. Brevik et al., 2015) can attest. The urban ecosystem depresses the importance of a few basic functions of soil, but often it broadens widens the variety of services that soil has to provide. The related information a classification must provide on urban soils must hence be even larger than that provided by

196 normal soil classifications, in particular expanded to other characteristics. A faceted system seems to
 197 be the best tool for fulfilling this goal.

198 Faceted classification was proposed by Ranganathan (1967) to organize information about books and
 199 was used to classify various items, such as computer software, patents, books, and artworks (Kwas-
 200 nik, 2002). Faceted classification is an advanced method of knowledge organization and information
 201 design and offers powerful and flexible information browsing and searching, and is particularly suit-
 202 able for the Web (Slavic, 2008). A FC consists of reciprocally exclusive and jointly exhaustive cate-
 203 gories, each one focused on a single aspect – a *facet* – of an item of an ensemble (Frické, 2013;
 204 Hjørland, 2013b; Perugini, 2010). Faceted classifications are widely used in e-commerce (Kwasnik,
 205 2002; Vickery, 2008); for instance, amazon.com uses brand, price, seller, as individual facets but also
 206 has facets that are specific to the current result set (Table 2). In the case of soils, each one would be
 207 tagged with a set of attributes and values related to its natural, economic, technical, material or sym-
 208 bolic qualities, and its final characterization would hence depend on how the user accesses the faceted
 209 system. The soil *unit* for which the information is collected and retrieved can be identified on different
 210 bases. It can be a cadastral parcel or a Land Unit (the smallest unit of land that has a permanent,
 211 contiguous boundary, a common land cover and land management, a common owner), or any other
 212 subdivision or soil entity that is necessary or desirable to tag. A database of such objects and tags can
 213 be flexibly interrogated in various ways, according to the desired information retrieval. The ad-
 214 vantages of a faceted classification applied to soils over other systems parallel those reported for
 215 bibliographic classifications (Broughton, 2006), i.e. i) the capacity to synthetically express the com-
 216 plexity of the object – and urban soils all in all are definitely very complex systems; ii) a syntax that
 217 allows for new facets to be easily introduced; iii) a logical structure that is compatible with both
 218 computer manipulation at whatever level (with geographical information systems in particular) and a
 219 graphical interface for end-user navigation and query formulation; iv) the facility to allow approaches
 220 from different angles (i.e. cross-domain query) and retrieve the set of all instances far more rapidly.

221 However, Hjørland (2013a,b) has pointed out two main limitations of a FC system when applied to
 222 general knowledge organization, viz. i) the lack of an empirical basis and ii) a speculative ordering
 223 of knowledge which is not based in the development of theories. Its basic assumption that relations
 224 between concepts may be set a priori and not through models or theories appears to be questionable.

225 ~~On the other hand,~~ Soil facets must be carefully chosen to make the system work properly. Discrete
 226 variables can only be used as facets or classes of continuous variables. Also, the facets need to be
 227 independent of each other so that any combination of values across facets is possible. This is not
 228 always true, e.g. for soil chemical properties, as some of the variables are correlated. In this case, just
 229 one of the correlated properties should be chosen as a facet. Within a facet, the values each facet may

230 assume need to be dependent, i.e. they have to be mutually exclusive and, while this is true for chem-
231 ical or biological properties, care must be taken that other properties are chosen to comply with this
232 requirement.

233 Vickery (1960) proposed a faceted classification of soils based on 18 facets (in SI, Table 1S), mostly
234 agriculture-oriented, but it was never fully developed. Here, we want to endorse the appropriateness
235 of preparing and using a faceted system for the organization of knowledge about urban soils. Below
236 we report a reasoned non-exhaustive list of facets that we feel are particularly meaningful for urban
237 soils.

238

239 *Physical and chemical properties*

240 Soil thickness, stoniness, and particle size distribution appear to be crucial for urban soil description.
241 Organic matter content, pH, and electrical conductivity (for salinity) are the most significant chemical
242 soil traits. All of them are usually measured as continuous variables but can also be expressed as
243 classes. For example, soil pH can be reported as acid, slightly acid, basic and so on, while the particle-
244 size distribution can be reported as clay, silt-loamy, sandy, etc.

245

246 *Pollution*

247 The extent and degree of soil pollution and type of pollutants (heavy metals, hydrocarbons, radionu-
248 clides, etc.) are fundamental information for the use and management of urban soils. Basic threshold
249 values can be the legislative concentration limits for contaminated soils. Further grades can, however,
250 be adopted based on the results of an environmental risk assessment. A faceted system is particularly
251 recommended for soil contamination in light of its adaptability to changes in legislation and the pos-
252 sibility to include values as they are obtained or other variables, i.e. previously ignored or unknown
253 contaminants.

254

255 *Landscape metrics*

256 Landscape metrics are numeric measurements that quantify spatial patterning of land cover patches,
257 land cover classes, or entire landscape mosaics of a geographic area (Lüscher et al., 2014; McGarigal
258 and Marks, 1995). For example, the Class Area metric is a measure of landscape composition; spe-
259 cifically, how much of the landscape is comprised in a particular patch type (e.g. accessibility to main
260 roads or proximity to nearby cities, as in Puertas et al., 2014).

261 The number of patches of a particular patch type is a simple measure of the extent of subdivision or
262 fragmentation of that patch type, while the edge density is the edge length on a per-unit-area basis
263 and facilitates comparison among landscapes of varying size (e.g. Borgogno-Mondino et al., 2015).
264 Several other metrics can be used as facets of urban soils.

265

266 *Ownership and other property rights*

267 The faceted system for urban soils in terms of ownership may be based on a simple division into
268 private and public, or include more information, such as right of way, partial usufruct, etc. Any in-
269 formation in this regard can be useful, for example, to a city administration that needs to tag soils
270 with its ownership (temporary lease of rights, limits on the intended use, ownership conflict) or other
271 planning characteristics.

272

273 *Aesthetical value of the area*

274 It is hard to think that the aesthetical value of an urban area does not have an influence on the judge-
275 ment of its soils. Bartie et al. (2010) elaborated and proposed visibility modelling algorithms for
276 urban environments, while Chamberlain and Meitner (2013) suggested a visibility analysis based on
277 several simple landscape features, such as slope, aspect and distance from the observer, all of which
278 could be facets for urban soils. An indirect method based on landscape pictures uploaded by users on
279 the Internet has been proposed by Casalegno et al. (2013). Aesthetics will eventually influence the
280 housing market, hence the relative soil facet might be based, at least partly, on the commercial value
281 of the neighbouring houses.

282

283 *Specific ecological functions*

284 Modern urban planning envisages the creation of ecological (green) corridors, which represent pre-
285 cious shelters and connectors for wildlife (Groome, 1990). The soils of green corridors are, of course,
286 expected to be safe and as fertile as possible, to sustain plant growth without the input of any chemi-
287 cals and allow a healthy life for people and animals. To be part of a green corridor and to not be
288 completely surrounded by sealed surfaces should be acknowledged as a highly positive feature of an
289 urban soil.

290

291 *Economic value*

292 Urban land price is a result of natural, economic and social factors, and represents a source of infor-
293 mation for planning (Hu et al., 2013). Monetary value is the most frequently quantified property of
294 an urban soil, so facets can be derived from its multiple expressions, be they either real or estimated.

295

296 *Social value*

297 Given the mass of people gravitating to urban areas, here more than elsewhere soils may assume a
298 high social value. Public green spaces play an important social role in the multifunctional and cultural
299 services of urban ecosystems (Lundy and Wade, 2011), such as providing spiritual and psychological

benefits as well as leisure and recreation opportunities. The most striking example of such an important role is perhaps that of community vegetable gardens, which are a unique intervention that can narrow the divide between people and the places where food is grown (Litt et al., 2011; Semenza and March, 2009). Indirect facets (e.g. human appropriation of net primary production, HANPP) can be used to account for the social value of urban soils (Niedertscheider and Erb, 2014), which is usually determined by hedonic pricing and contingent valuation (Brander and Koetse, 2011).

Historical value

The intrinsic value of an urban soil can be chiefly due to the presence of valuable ancient artefacts, and also by the impalpable past occurrence of a memorable event of public relevance. Beyond the constraints imposed by the government, it would be senseless, for example, to consider the couple of hectares of meadow within Rome occupied by the Circus Maximus (Figure 1) as any other equivalent piece of land. Some past events occurred in given areas just because of the characteristics of their soils (i.e. duels and battles on soils selected just because of their high or poor bearing capacity), which should therefore be acknowledged and preserved. In other cases, urban soils are the result of efforts aimed at making them suitable for specific purposes, such as the creation of historical gardens (Delgado et al., 2007). Such efforts, including the provenance of the soil material, where this is allochthonous, should be acknowledged in classifying those soils, just because of their value as historical memories (Beach et al., 2015).

Additional facets may deal not with soil *per se*, but with the conditions affecting its ecology and fertility, such as, for example, the extent of solar radiation it receives all year long; Italian legislation includes a *shadow* tax that relates to the shape of buildings and their interference on solar irradiation of adjacent soils (Gazzetta Ufficiale, 1997). Also, proxy indicators of ongoing peri-urbanization processes based, for instance, on a differentiation into displaced-urbanization, ex-urbanization, anti-urbanization and hidden-urbanization could be used as facets for our purpose (Zasada et al., 2011).

The organization of soil information – including that provided by canonical classification – in a facet repository undoubtedly helps in overcoming the problems of spatial data resolution highlighted by Schmit et al. (2006). When interrogated, a faceted system for urban soils would produce a list of soils that are, for example, silty, acid, not contaminated by heavy metals, with a tolerable content of hydrocarbons, smaller than 100 m² and with a rectangular shape, flat, surrounded by buildings on just two sides, state-owned, insignificant from the aesthetical and historical points of view but socially and ecologically valuable. The result would be meaningful in terms of urban planning and highly useful for easily intercepting potential land uses. The organization of soil data in facets would make

333 it easy to create thematic maps for individual properties (e.g. land metrics, specific pollution, prop-
334 erty, economic value, mapping error estimates ...), regardless of data standard format and complete
335 availability.

336 A faceted system would be particularly convenient where the information about soils is missing or
337 scattered, as frequently happens in urban settings (Figures 2 and 3). The system can in fact work with
338 any amount of information and progressively host new data, when they are, for example, obtained or
339 imported from other city services (e.g. the cadastre may feed its data into the system while the envi-
340 ronment department is still making investigations). In fact, it is becoming possible and desirable to
341 update soil map information (Sun et al., 2015). The FC system is also flexible in accepting changes
342 in the limit values of the classes, as when the legal thresholds for contamination are changed (Table
343 2). This implies advantages for the local administration, which would deal with a much more under-
344 standable and easy-to-apply system. Armentano et al. (2014) have in fact reported that the use of a
345 faceted system allows a search engine to be devised that produces user-friendly presentations for non-
346 expert users.

347 It has been postulated that a post-coordination approach, i.e. mixing different properties – facets – in
348 an unusual way, may allow new associations of elements to be discovered (Elliott et al., 2000; Kwas-
349 nik, 1999), hence generating new knowledge. A faceted system would be highly appropriate for fol-
350 lowing the evolution of open data sets, integrating territorial systems with the concept of learning
351 territorial networks (Finka and Kluvánková, 2015). Environmental data sharing, remote sensing, and
352 visualization tools and practices can also support next-generation ecosystem service modelling (Bag-
353 stad et al., 2013). Archives that contain a huge mass of soil information in a digital format are avail-
354 able worldwide, but a combined exploration of this large collection of soil data is hindered by their
355 multivariate nature (Beaudette et al., 2013) and a faceted system would help in exploiting the data.
356 Crowd-mapping, a combination of social activism, citizen journalism and geospatial information, is
357 rapidly growing and urban soil mapping should benefit from it. This approach, which was first applied
358 to arable/natural soils, is now expanding towards urban areas. Combining crowd-mapping and a fac-
359 eted system of nomenclature could be a winning strategy to improve the knowledge of urban soils.

360

361 **3. Conclusions**

362 Current systems of soil classification show some limitations in accounting for what is commonly
363 needed for the use and management of urban soils, mostly because they were built on a genetic base
364 and for agricultural purposes. Temporal and spatial variability of soil in the urban context is so high
365 and unpredictable compared to agricultural or natural soils that systematization and transmission of
366 the information on urban soils becomes an overwhelming task. This is the main reason why unsealed

367 urban soils are currently mapped as indistinct areas included in the patches representing urban settle-
368 ments.

369 A faceted system of categorization based on both tangible and immaterial features and values could
370 more adequately account for the complexity of the world of urban soils than classic soil classifica-
371 tions. In addition, it would show the flexibility necessary to progressively accommodate the flow of
372 scattered, rapidly changing, sometimes incomplete, data that are being continuously collected. If con-
373 stantly updated once new information is provided, such a system of classification of urban soils would
374 be a pivotal tool for urban and peri-urban landscape planning and management.

375

376

377 **4. References**

378 Abrahams, P.W., 2006. Soil, geography and human disease: A critical review of the importance of
379 medical cartography. *Progr. Phys. Geogr.* 30, 490–512.

380 Adhikari K., Hartemink A.E., 2016. Linking soils to ecosystem services – A global review. *Geoderma*
381 262, 101–111.

382 Ajmone-Marsan, F., Biasioli, M., 2010. Trace elements in soils of urban areas. *Water Air Soil Poll.*
383 213, 121–143.

384 Andersson, M., Ottesen, R.T., Langedal, M., 2010. Geochemistry of urban surface soils – Monitoring
385 in Trondheim, Norway. *Geoderma* 156, 112–118.

386 Anonymous, 2010. Cities: The century of the city. *Nature* 467, 900–901.

387 Aparin, B.F., Sukhacheva, E.Yu., 2014. Principles of soil mapping of a megalopolis with St. Peters-
388 burg as an example. *Eurasian Soil Sci.* 47, 650–661.

389 Armentano, M.G., Godoy, D., Campo, M., Amandi, A., 2014. NLP-based faceted search: Experience
390 in the development of a science and technology search engine. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 41, 2886–
391 2896.

392 Arnold, R.W., 2006. Concepts of soils. In: Certini, G., Scalenghe, R., (Eds.), *Soils: Basic Concepts*
393 *and Future Challenges*. Cambridge University Press, UK, pp. 1–10.

394 Bagstad, K.J., Semmen, D.J., Waage, S., Winthrop, R., 2013. A comparative assessment of decision-
395 support tools for ecosystem services quantification and valuation. *Ecosys. Serv.* 5, e27–e29.

396 Bartie, P., Reitsma, F., Kingham, S., Mills, S., 2010. Advancing visibility modelling algorithms for
397 urban environments. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* 34, 518–531.

398 Beach, T., Luzzadder-Beach, S., Cook, D., Dunning, N., Kennett, D.J., Krause, S., Terry, R., Trein,
399 D., Valdez, F., 2015. Ancient Maya impacts on the Earth's surface: An Early Anthropocene
400 analog? *Quatern. Sci. Rev.* 124, 1–30.

401 Beaudette, D.E., Roudier, P., O'Geen, A.T., 2013. Algorithms for quantitative pedology: A toolkit
402 for soil scientists. *Comput. Geosci.* 52, 258–268.

403 Biasioli, M., Barberis, R., Ajmone-Marsan, F., 2006. The influence of a large city on some soil prop-
404 erties and metals content. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 356, 154–164.

405 Boaga, J., 2013. An efficient tool for cultural heritage seismic soil classification: Frequency time
406 analysis method in Venice historical center and its lagoon (Italy). *Geosci. J.* 17, 301–311.

407 Borgogno-Mondino, E., Fabiatti, G., Ajmone-Marsan, F., 2015. Soil quality and landscape metrics
408 as driving factors in a multi-criteria GIS procedure for peri-urban land use planning. *Urban*
409 *For. Urban Green.* 14, 743–750.

410 Bouma, J., Droogers, P., 2007. Translating soil science into environmental policy: A case study on
411 implementing the EU soil protection strategy in The Netherlands. *Env. Sci. Pol.* 10, 454–463.

412 Brander, L.M., Koetse, M.J., 2011. The value of urban open space: Meta-analyses of contingent val-
413 uation and hedonic pricing results. *J. Environ. Manage.* 92, 2763–2773.

414 Brevik, E.C., Calzolari, C., Miller, B.A., Pereira, P., Kabala, C., Baumgarten, A., Jordán, A., 2015.
415 Soil mapping, classification, and pedologic modeling: History and future directions. *Ge-*
416 *oderma* (in press) doi>10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.05.017

417 Broughton, V., 2006. The need for a faceted classification as the basis of all methods of information
418 retrieval. *Aslib Proceed.* 58, 49–72.

419 Casalegno, S., Inger, R., DeSilvey, C., Gaston, K.J., 2013. Spatial covariance between aesthetic value
420 and other ecosystem services. *PLoS ONE* 8, e68437 doi>10.1371/journal.pone.0068437

421 Cattle, J.A., McBratney, A.B., Minasny, B., 2002. Kriging method evaluation for assessing the spatial
422 distribution of urban soil lead contamination. *J. Environ. Qual.* 31, 1576–1588.

423 Chamberlain, B.C., Meitner, M.J., 2013. A route-based visibility analysis for landscape management.
424 *Land. Urban Plann.* 111, 13–24.

425 Chatterjee, K., Choudhury, D., 2013. Variations in shear wave velocity and soil site class in Kolkata
426 city using regression and sensitivity analysis. *Nat. Hazards* 69, 2057–2082.

427 Commission of the European Communities. 2006. Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection.
428 COM(2006)231 final.

429 Costa, C., Reis, A.P., Ferreira da Silva, E., Rocha, F., Patinha, C., Dias, A.C., Sequeira, C., Terroso,
430 D., 2012. Assessing the control exerted by soil mineralogy in the fixation of potentially harm-
431 ful elements in the urban soils of Lisbon, Portugal. *Environ. Earth Sci.* 65, 1133–1145.

432 Curran-Cournane, F., Vaughan, M., Memon, A., Fredrickson, C., 2014. Trade-offs between high-
433 class land and development: Recent and future pressures on Auckland's valuable soil re-
434 sources. *Land Use Pol.* 39, 146–154.

435 Delgado R., Martín-García, J.M., Calero, J., Casares-Porcel, M., Tito-Rojo, J., Delgado G., 2007.
 436 The historic man-made soils of the Generalife garden (La Alhambra, Granada, Spain). *Eur. J.*
 437 *Soil Sci.* 58, 215–228.

438 Deng, X., 2007. New trends in digital terrain analysis: Landform definition, representation, and clas-
 439 sification. *Progr. Phys. Geogr.* 31, 405–419.

440 Dudal, R., Deckers, J., Van Orshoven, J., Van Ranst, E. (2005). Soil survey in Belgium and its appli-
 441 cations. In: Jones, R.J.A., Houšková, B., Bullock, P., Montanarella, L. (Eds.), *Soil Resources*
 442 *of Europe*, 2nd edition. European Soil Bureau Research Report No. 9, EUR 20559 EN. Office
 443 for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

444 Elliott, S., Decker, E., Smith, F.A., Blake, D.R., Simpson, I.J., Sherwood Rowland, F., 2000. Cities
 445 in the earth system. *Env. Sci. Pol.* 3, 157–160.

446 Ellis, E.C., 2011. Anthropogenic transformation of the terrestrial biosphere. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc.*
 447 *A* 369, 1010–1035.

448 European Environment Agency, 2011. Landscape Fragmentation in Europe. Report No 2/2011. EEA,
 449 Copenhagen, DK.

450 Finka, M., Kluvánková, T., 2015. Managing complexity of urban systems: A polycentric approach.
 451 *Land Use Pol.* 42, 602–608.

452 Fitzpatrick, E.A., 1967. Soil nomenclature and classification. *Geoderma* 1, 91–105.

453 Frické, M.H., 2013. Facets: Ersatz, resource and tag. *Information Research*, 18(3) paper C25. Down-
 454 loadable at: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1044660.pdf>

455 Gardi, C., Jeffery, S., Saltelli, A., 2013. An estimate of potential threat levels to soil biodiversity in
 456 EU. *Glob. Change Biol.* 19, 1538–1548.

457 Gazzetta Ufficiale, 1997. Decreto Legislativo 15 dicembre 1997, n. 446. Gazzetta Ufficiale n. 298
 458 del 23 dicembre 1997. Repubblica Italiana, Roma, IT.

459 Giusti, L., 2011. Heavy metals in urban soils of Bristol (UK). Initial screening for contaminated land.
 460 *J. Soil Sedim.* 11, 1385–1398.

461 Grimm, N.B., Faeth, S.H., Golubiewski, N.E., Redman, C.L., Wu, J., Bai, X., Briggs J.M., 2008.
 462 Global change and the ecology of cities. *Science* 319, 756–760.

463 Groome, D., 1990. Green corridors – A discussion of a planning concept. *Land Urban Plann.* 19, 383–
 464 387.

465 Guillén, M.T., Delgado, J., Albanese, S., Nieto, J.M., Lima, A., De Vivo, B., 2012. Heavy metals
 466 fractionation and multivariate statistical techniques to evaluate the environmental risk in soils
 467 of Huelva Township (SW Iberian Peninsula). *J. Geochem. Explor.* 119–120, 32–43.

468 Han, S.S., 2010. Urban expansion in contemporary China: What can we learn from a small town?
 469 *Land Use Pol.* 27, 780–787.

470 Hartemink, A.E., Krasilnikov, P., Bockheim, J.G., 2013. Soil maps of the world. *Geoderma* 207–208,
471 256–267.

472 Heuvelink, G.B.M., Webster, R., 2001. Modelling soil variation: Past, present, and future. *Geoderma*
473 100, 269–301.

474 [Hjørland, B. 2013a. Theories of Knowledge Organization—Theories of Knowledge. *Knowledge Or-*](#)
475 [*ganization*. 40, 169-181.](#)

476 Hjørland, B., 2013**b**. Facet analysis: The logical approach to knowledge organization. *Inform. Pro-*
477 *cess. Manage.* 49, 545–557.

478 Hollis, J.M., 1991. The classification of soils in urban areas. In: Bullock, P., Gregory, PJ, (Eds.), *Soils*
479 *in the Urban Environment*. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK, pp. 5–27.

480 Holmgren, G.G.S., 1988. The point representation of soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 52: 712–716.

481 Hou, D., Al-Tabbaa, A., 2014 Sustainability: A new imperative in contaminated land remediation.
482 *Environ. Sci. Pol.*, 39: 25–34.

483 Hu, S., Cheng, Q., Wang, L., Xu, D., 2013. Modeling land price distribution using multifractal IDW
484 interpolation and fractal filtering method. *Land. Urban Plann.* 110, 25–35.

485 Ibáñez, J.J., Zinck, J.A., Dazzi, C., 2013. Soil geography and diversity of the European biogeograph-
486 ical regions. *Geoderma* 192, 142–153.

487 IUSS Working Group WRB, 2014. World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014. International soil
488 classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps. *World Soil Re-*
489 *sources Reports* No. 106. FAO, Rome.

490 Jeffery, S., Gardi, C., Jones, A., Montanarella, L., Marmo, L., Miko, L., Ritz, K., Peres, G., Römbke,
491 J., van der Putten, W.H. (eds.), 2010. *European Atlas of Soil Biodiversity*. European Com-
492 mission, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

493 Kabisch, N., 2015. Ecosystem service implementation and governance challenges in urban green
494 space planning –The case of Berlin, Germany. *Land Use Pol.* 42, 557–567.

495 Kara, C., Doratli, N., 2012. Application of GIS/AHP in siting sanitary landfill: A case study in North-
496 ern Cyprus. *Waste Manage. Res.* 30, 966–980.

497 Kasanko, M., Barredo, J.I., Laval, C., McCormick, N., Demicheli, L., Sagris, V., Brezger, A., 2006.
498 Are European cities becoming dispersed? A comparative analysis of 15 European urban areas.
499 *Land. Urban Plann.* 77, 111–130.

500 Kent, M., 2009. Biogeography and landscape ecology: The way forward – Gradients and graph the-
501 ory. *Progr. Phys. Geogr.* 33, 424–436.

502 Kwasnik, B.H., 1999. The role of classification in knowledge representation and discovery. *Libr.*
503 *Trends* 48, 22–47.

504 Kwasnik, B.H., 2002. Commercial websites and the use of classification schemes: The case of ama-
505 zon.com. In: Lopez-Huertas, M.J., (Ed.), *Challenges in Knowledge Representation and Or-*
506 *ganization for the 21st Century: Integration of Knowledge Across Boundaries* (pp. 279–285).
507 *Proceedings of the Seventh International ISKO Conference. Ergon, Würzburg, DE.*

508 Lebedeva, I.I., Gerasimova, M.I., 2011. Possibilities of including the taxonomy of soils and parent
509 materials of Moscow City into the classification system of the soils of Russia. *Eur. Soil Sci.*
510 44, 572–575.

511 Lehmann, A., Stahr, K., 2007. Nature and significance of anthropogenic urban soils. *J. Soil Sedim.*
512 7, 247–260.

513 Litt, J.S., Soobader, M.-J., Turbin, M.S., Hale, J.W., Buchenau, M., Marshall, J.A., 2011. The influ-
514 ence of social involvement, neighborhood aesthetics, and community garden participation on
515 fruit and vegetable consumption. *Am. J. Public Health* 101, 1466–1473.

516 Lorenz, K., Lal, R., 2009. Biogeochemical C and N cycles in urban soils. *Environ. Intern.* 35, 1–8.

517 Lundy, L., Wade, R., 2011. Integrating sciences to sustain urban ecosystem services. *Progr. Phys.*
518 *Geogr.* 35, 653–669.

519 Lüscher, G., Schneider, M.K., Turnbull, L.A., Arndorfer, M., Bailey, D., Herzog, F., Pointereau, P.,
520 Richner, N., Jeanneret, P., 2014. Appropriate metrics to inform farmers about species diver-
521 sity. *Env. Sci. Pol.* 41, 52–62.

522 McGarigal, K., Marks, B.J., 1995. FRAGSTATS: Spatial Pattern Analysis Program for Quantifying
523 Landscape Structure. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-351. US Department of Agricul-
524 ture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, USA

525 Maruani, T., Amit-Cohen, I., 2013. Marketing landscapes: The use of landscape values in advertise-
526 ments of development projects. *Land. Urban Plann.* 114, 92–101.

527 Moeinaddini, M., Khorasani, N., Danehkar, A., Darvishsefat, A.A., Zienalyan, M., 2010. Siting
528 MSW landfill using weighted linear combination and analytical hierarchy process (AHP)
529 methodology in GIS environment (case study: Karaj). *Waste Manage.* 30, 912–920.

530 Morillo, E., Romero, A.S., Maqueda, C., Madrid, L., Ajmone-Marsan, F., Grčman, H., Davidson,
531 C.M., Hursthouse, A.S., Villaverde, J., 2007. Soil pollution by PAHs in urban soils: A com-
532 parison of three European cities. *J. Environ. Monit.* 9, 1001–1008.

533 Natural Environment Research Council, 2013. mySoil. Version 2.0. Free app in English ©NERC, UK.

534 Nehls, T., Rokia, S., Mekiffer, B., Schwartz, C., Wessolek, G., 2013. Contribution of bricks to urban
535 soil properties. *J. Soil Sedim.* 13, 575–584.

536 Niedertscheider, M., Erb, K., 2014. Land system change in Italy from 1884 to 2007: Analysing the
537 North–South divergence on the basis of an integrated indicator framework. *Land Use Pol.* 39,
538 366–375.

539 Norra, S., Stüben, D., 2003. Urban soils. *J. Soil Sedim.* 3, 230–233.

540 Nuissl, H., Haase, D., Lanzendorf, M., Wittmerd, H., 2009. Environmental impact assessment of
541 urban land use transitions – A context-sensitive approach. *Land Use Pol.* 26, 414–424.

542 Panduro, T.E., Veie, K.L., 2013. Classification and valuation of urban green spaces – A hedonic
543 house price valuation. *Land. Urban Plann.* 120, 119–128.

544 Perugini, S., 2010. Supporting multiple paths to objects in information hierarchies: Faceted classifi-
545 cation, faceted search, and symbolic links. *Inf. Proc. Manage.* 46, 22–43.

546 Pickett, S.T.A., Cadenasso, M.L., Grove, J.M., Boone, C.G., Groffman, P.M., Irwin, E., Kaushal,
547 S.S., Marshall, V., McGrath, B.P., Nilon, C.H., Pouyat, R.V., Szlavecz, K., Troy, A., Warren,
548 P., 2011. Urban ecological systems: Scientific foundations and a decade of progress. *J.*
549 *Environ. Manage.* 92, 331–362.

550 Puertas, O.L., Henríquez, C., Meza, F.J., 2014. Assessing spatial dynamics of urban growth using an
551 integrated land use model. Application in Santiago Metropolitan Area, 2010–2045. *Land Use*
552 *Pol.* 38, 415–425.

553 Qiao, M., Chao Cai, C., Huang, Y., Liu, Y., Lin, A., Zheng, Y., 2011. Characterization of soil heavy
554 metal contamination and potential health risk in metropolitan region of northern China. *Envi-*
555 *ron. Monit. Assess.* 172, 353–365.

556 Qin, J., Zhou, X., Sun, C., Leng, H., Lian, Z., 2013. Influence of green spaces on environmental
557 satisfaction and physiological status of urban residents. *Urban For. Urban Green.* 12, 490–
558 497.

559 Ranganathan, S.R., 1967. *Prolegomena to Library Classification*, 2nd ed. 1957, 3rd ed. 1967. London:
560 Asia Publishing House. <http://hdl.handle.net/10150/106370>

561 Rossiter, D.G., 2007. Classification of urban and industrial soils in the World Reference Base for Soil
562 Resources. *J. Soils Sedim.* 7, 96–100.

563 Sanchez, P.A., Couto, W., Buol, S.W., 1982. The fertility capability soil classification system: Inter-
564 pretation, applicability and modification. *Geoderma* 27, 283–309.

565 Sanchez, P.A., Palm, C.A., Buol, S.W., 2003. Fertility capability soil classification: A tool to help
566 assess soil quality in the tropics. *Geoderma* 114, 157–185.

567 Sanchez, P.A., Ahamed, S., Carré, F., Hartemink, A.E., Hempel, J., Huising, J., Lagacherie, P.,
568 McBratney, A.B., McKenzie, N.J., de Lourdes Mendonça-Santos, M., Minasny, B., Montana-
569 rella, L., Okoth, P., Palm, C.A., Sachs, J.D., Shepherd, K.D., Vågen, T.G., Vanlauwe, B.,
570 Walsh, M.G., Winowiecki, L.A., Zhang, G.L., 2009. Digital soil map of the world. *Science*
571 325, 680–681.

572 Scalenghe, R., Ajmone-Marsan, F., 2009. The anthropogenic sealing of soils in urban areas. *Land.*
573 *Urban Plann.* 90, 1–10.

574 Scalenghe, R., Malucelli, F., Fabrizio, U., Perazzone, L., Filippi, N., Edwards, A.C., 2011. Influence
575 of 150 years of land use on anthropogenic and natural carbon stocks in Emilia-Romagna Re-
576 gion (Italy). *Environ. Sci. Techn.* 45, 5112–5117.

577 Scharenbroch, B.C., Lloyd, J.E., Johnson-Maynard, J.L., 2005. Distinguishing urban soils with phys-
578 ical, chemical, and biological properties. *Pedobiologia* 49, 283–296.

579 Schmidt, R., Daeumlich, D., Reuter, H.I., 2004. From point over regions to the landscape – Spatial
580 generalization in the soil landscape research. *Arch. Agron. Soil Sci.* 50, 241–257.

581 Schmit, C., Rounsevell, M.D.A., La Jeunesse, I., 2006. The limitations of spatial land use data in
582 environmental analysis. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* 6, 174–188.

583 Schoeneberger, P.J., Wysocki, D.A., Benham, E.C., Broderson, W.D., 2002. *Field Book for Describ-*
584 *ing and Sampling Soils. Version 2.0.* Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Soil
585 Survey Center, Lincoln, NE.

586 Schulte, R.P.O., Creamer, R.E., Donnellan, T., Farrelly, N., Fealy, R., O'Donoghue, C., Daire
587 O'hUallachain, D., 2014. Functional land management: A framework for managing soil-based
588 ecosystem services for the sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* 38, 45–
589 58.

590 Schwarz, K., Pickett, S.T.A., Lathrop, R.G., Weathers, K.C., Pouyat, R.V., Cadenasso, M.L., 2012.
591 The effects of the urban built environment on the spatial distribution of lead in residential
592 soils. *Environ. Pollut.* 163, 32–39.

593 Semenza, J.C., March, T.L., 2009. An urban community-based intervention to advance social inter-
594 actions. *Environ. Behav.* 41, 22–42.

595 Slavic, A., 2008. Faceted classification: Management and use. *Axiomathes* 18, 257–271.

596 Soil Survey Staff, 2014. *Keys to Soil Taxonomy*, 12th ed. USDA-Natural Resources Conservation
597 Service. Washington, DC.

598 Sun, X.-L., Wu, Y.-J., Lou, Y.-L., Wang, H.-L., Zhang, C., Zhao, Y.-G., Zhang, G.-L., 2015. Updat-
599 ing digital soil maps with new data: A case study of soil organic matter in Jiangsu, China.
600 *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* doi>10.1111/ejss.12295

601 Tzoulas, K., James, P., 2010. Making biodiversity measures accessible to non-specialists: An inno-
602 vative method for rapid assessment of urban biodiversity. *Urban Ecosys.* 13, 113–127.

603 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2014. *World Ur-*
604 *banization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/352).*

605 Vasenev, V.I., Stoorvogel, J.J., Vasenev, I.I., Valentini, R., 2014. How to map soil organic carbon
606 stocks in highly urbanized regions? *Geoderma* 226–227, 103–115.

607 Vickery, B.C., 1960. *Faceted Classification: A Guide to Construction and Use of Special Schemes.*
608 Aslib, London, UK.

609 Vickery, B.C., 2008. Faceted classification for the web. *Axiomathes* 18, 145–160.

610 Vilček, J., Bujnovský, R., 2014. Soil environmental index for Slovak agricultural land. *Pedosphere*
611 24, 137–144.

612 Wang, X-T., Miao, Y., Zhang, Y., Li, Y-C., Wu, M-H., Yu, G., 2013. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocar-
613 bons (PAHs) in urban soils of the megacity Shanghai: Occurrence, source apportionment and
614 potential human health risk. *Sci. Tot. Environ.* 447, 80–89.

615 Zasada, I., Fertner, C., Piore, A., Nielsen, T.S., 2011. Peri-urbanisation and multifunctional adaptation
616 of agriculture around Copenhagen. *Dan. J. Geogr.* 111, 59–72.

Table captions:

Table 1. Soil properties that are currently observed and annotated in the field for conventional soil classification (modified from Schoeneberger et al., 2002)

Table 2. A faceted classification as employed by Amazon.com and which could be used for urban soils

Amazon numbers brand, price, and seller as individual facets. The first two columns on the left show a search made on Amazon.com; the first one in particular shows the results from a search using the keyword ‘computer’. Amazon also have facets that are specific to the current result set, which are shown in the second column where the results of the first column are filtered using the word ‘Windows 8’ (in parentheses are the number of items found). A plausible example of search through an urban soil database organized by facets using the keyword ‘Urban Soil’ is the one reported in the third column, which in the fourth one is filtered by the keyword ‘Ownership’.

Figure captions:

Figure 1: a–e) examples of soils in an urban and peri-urban environment; g) the ancient Roman chariot racing stadium *Circus Maximus* (photo: Ministero dell’Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare; location 41°53’9.26”N, 12°29’8.53”E) h) a road junction encompasses soils that are subtracted for any other use (photo: Google Earth; location 45°01’20”N; 7°35’52”E). (The expression ‘peri-urban’, first used in France [and Switzerland], describes spaces shaped by the urbanization between the city and the rural area, in the urban fringe. Peri-urban both in a social [e.g. lifestyle] and in a physical [e.g. land use change] sense).

Figure 2. A statistically representative sampling of urban soils appears to be impossible. A grid is superposed on a city map in order to plan a systematic survey. However, only the areas in green are open soils and they would not provide a statistically sound representation of soil spatial variability.

Figure 3: Facets vs canonical soil categorizations. In a non-urban context (a): soil is sampled, then the data of all concerned property useful for its classification is spatialized and a soil scientist can draw a soil map. From these maps a land planner or any stakeholder can infer soil properties of non-observed points from their taxonomic classification. In an urban context (b): the city (dark area) does not allow for a representative sampling of soils, the spatialization of data can be made only in open soil areas. Within the urban area, there is not sufficient information to be able to assign a proper soil

652 classification to an area, only an individual point can be classified, if it is observed directly. It is not
653 possible to extract any plausible information from non-observed points. In an urban+peri-urban con-
654 text (c): the city (dark area) and areas that have been, e.g. brownfields, or will become urban (grey
655 areas) do not allow a mapping of the soils due to the unfeasibility of spatialization punctual taxonomic
656 categorization. In an urban+peri-urban context (d): the city (dark area) and areas that have been, e.g.
657 brownfields, or will become urban (grey areas) are continually being dug/surveyed/explored for dif-
658 ferent purposes. The number of observations is very high; the characteristics of the collected data are
659 heterogeneous and independent from a formal framework of any existing classification systems. The
660 organization of these data in facets makes it possible to create thematic maps for individual properties
661 (e.g., land metrics, specific pollution, property, economic value ...), depending on the data availability
662 only.